



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,872	08/27/2003	David M. Avery	PHB 34,372A	4908
24737	7590	11/01/2005	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			SHIMIZU, MATSUICHIRO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2635	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/648,872	Applicant(s) AVERY, DAVID M.	
	Examiner Matsuichiro Shimizu	Art Unit 2635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 27 and 28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/27/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Preliminary Amendment

The examiner acknowledges canceled claims 1-10 and new claims 11-28.

Non-Statutory Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 11-15, 17, 19-23 and 25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,657,549. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are generally *broader* than the claims in Patent No. 6,657,549. Broader claims in a latter application constitute obvious double patenting of narrow claims in an issued patent. See *In re Van Ornum and Stang*, 214, USPQ 761, 766 and 767 (CCPA) (the court sustained an obvious double patenting rejection of generic claims in a continuation application over

Art Unit: 2635

narrower species claims in an issued patent); In re Vogel, 164 USPQ 619, 622, and 623 (CCPA 1970) (generic application claim specifying "meat" is obvious double patenting of narrow patent claim specifying "pork").

All subject matters except the transponding station receives and transmits on a first frequency in claims 17 and 25 are claimed above with regards to claims 11 and 19.

However, PAT-549 claims transponding station receive and transmits wireless signal in claims 1-2. Furthermore, one skilled in the art recognizes wireless signal transmission and reception is provided by variety frequency configuration, and the transponding station receives and transmits on a first frequency is one of many frequency configurations.

Therefore, one skilled in the art recognizes the transponding station receives and transmits on a first frequency is a matter of choice in design through routine experimentation in order to achieve optimum operation.

Therefore rejection of the subject matters expressed in claims 17 and 25 are met by references and associated arguments applied to rejection of claims 11 and 19 and to rejection provided in the previous paragraph.

Claims 16, 18, 24 and 26 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,657,549 in view of Shober (EP0851239A1).

Regarding claims 16, 18, 24 and 26, PAT-549 does not claim the transponding station transmits the reply signal at a first frequency corresponding substantially to a second frequency to which the radio units are tuned.

Art Unit: 2635

However, Shober teaches, in the art of wireless communication system, the transponding station (col. 3, lines 13-19, tag) transmits the reply signal at a first frequency (col. 3, lines 13-19, subcarrier or backscatter frequency as a first frequency) corresponding substantially to a second frequency to which the radio units (col. 3, lines 13-19, a second frequency as interrogator or radio unit frequency) are tuned for the purpose of reducing communication error. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the transponding station transmits the reply signal at a first frequency corresponding substantially to a second frequency to which the radio units are tuned in the device of PAT-549 because PAT-549 claims the transponding station transmits the reply signal (claims 1-2) and Shober teaches the transponding station transmits the reply signal at a first frequency corresponding substantially to a second frequency to which the radio units are tuned for the purpose of reducing communication error.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matsuichiro Shimizu whose telephone number is 571-272-3066. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik, can be reached on 571-272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3068.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-8576).

Matsuichiro Shimizu
October 22, 2005

MICHAEL HORABIK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

